

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 9-16 and 18 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended and claims 8 and 17 have been canceled by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-8 and 10-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as unpatentable over Grigor et al. in view of Hodgkinson; and claims 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as unpatentable over Grigor et al. in view of Hodgkinson and Yui.

Claims 1-8 and 10-17 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as unpatentable over Grigor et al. in view of Hodgkinson. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to include subject matter similar to that recited in dependent claims 8 and 17, respectively. For example, independent claim 1 is directed to a method for controlling a resolution of a graphic image, which includes (a) selecting a first resolution value of the graphic image to be displayed on an external display unit, (b) additionally selecting a second resolution value corresponding to a valid screen size of the external display unit, in which the second resolution value is less than the first resolution value, (c) confirming a source type on the graphic image to be displayed on the external display unit and a screen mode, and (d) referring to at least one from the selected first and second resolution values and reconfiguring the graphic image, according to a result of the confirmation claim 1 has also been amended to recite that if the source type of the confirmed graphic image is a source type other than a video or broadcast image or is a video or broadcast image based on a screen mode other

than a full screen mode, the referring step (d) refers to the first and second resolution values, and if the source type of the confirmed graphic image is a video or broadcast image or is a video or broadcast image based on a full screen mode, the referring step (d) refers only to the first resolution value. Independent claim 10 includes similar features in varying scope.

These features are supported at least by steps S19-S21 in Figure 4 and page 7, line 10 to page 8, line 1. For example, as shown in Figure 4, if the source type of the confirmed graphic image is a source type other than a video or broadcast image or is a video or broadcast image based on a screen mode other than a full screen mode (NO in S19), the referring step (d) refers to the first and second resolution values (selected in steps S13 and S15), and if the source type of the confirmed graphic image is a video or broadcast image or is a video or broadcast image based on a full screen mode (YES in S19), the referring step (d) refers only to the first resolution value (selected in step S13).

Regarding step (c) in which the source type is confirmed, the Office Action indicates the source type refers to a drawing surface setting including a resolution of 1024 \*768, 720\*540, 640\*480, etc., and cites column 4, lines 38-60 of Grigor et al. However, according to the present invention, the source type of the graphic image is interpreted as information about whether or not the graphic image is a source type other than a video or broadcast image or is a video or broadcast image based on a screen mode other than a full screen mode. Grigor et al. does not teach or suggest these features. Hodgkinson also does not teach or suggest these features.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1 and 10 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Further, it is respectfully submitted the rejection of claims 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Grigor et al. in view of Hodgkinson and Yui has also been overcome as claims 9 and 18 are dependent claims and Yui also does not teach or suggest the features recited in the corresponding independent claims.


In addition, it is respectfully requested this amendment be entered as it is believed no new issues have been raised.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, please contact David A. Bilodeau, Reg. No. 42,325 at the offices of Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Esther H. Chong  
Registration No.: 40,953  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Rd  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant

EHC/DAB/cra